

REMARKS

Claims 2, 18, 20, 36, 37, 39 are amended, claims 1 and 19 were canceled, and claims 40-42 are added. After entry of these amendments, claims 2-18 and 20-42 will be pending.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103(A)

Claims 2, 12-15, 17, 18, 20, 30-33, 35, 36, 38 and 39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Belfiore in view of Mikheev. Claims 3-8 and 21-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Belfiore in view of Mikheev and Konig. Claims 9-11 and 27-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Belfiore in view of Mikheev and Sommerer. Claims 16, 34 and 37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Belfiore in view of Mikheev and Dumais.

Claim 2, as amended, recites a method comprising:

receiving a term in an input field;

generating a user context-dependent search query based at least in part on a user context and the term, the search query for searching an article index for a first article identifier identifying a first article associated with the term;

receiving the first article identifier;

displaying in a transient menu associated with the input field the first article identifier and *at least one hyperlinked menu item included within the first article.*

Claim 1 describes a method for receiving a term in an input field, searching an article index for a first article identifier identifying a first article associated with the term, and displaying the received first article identifier and at least one hyperlinked menu item from the first article in a transient menu. One example of “displaying in a transient menu associated with the input field the first article identifier and at least one hyperlinked menu item included

within the first article” is depicted in Figure 6 (see “feedback, email, help, recipes, chefs, restaurant jobs” menu items next to the “Bobby Flay on StarChefs” first article identifier). The other independent claims, 18 and 20, recite limitations similar to some of the limitations found in claim 1.

The cited references make no such mention of “displaying in a transient menu associated with the input field the first article identifier and *at least one hyperlinked menu item included within the first article.*” Belfiore, at best, discusses the display of a menu of search results (column 8, lines 1-11). The Examiner recognizes on page 3 of the pending Office Action that “Belfiore does not teach the additional article identifier associated with an additional article.” Indeed, nowhere does Belfiore mention that the display of the search result menu includes displaying a first article identifier and at least one hyperlinked menu item included within the first article, in a transient menu.

Mikheev does not remedy the deficiencies of Belfiore. Generally, Mikheev discusses a way to cluster search results based on a logical relationship. (Abstract) In the pending Office Action, the Examiner relies on Figure 4 of Mikheev, which shows a standard set of search results, and paragraph 6, which discusses how the files are clustered. Mikheev fails to mention displaying a first article identifier and at least one hyperlinked menu item included within the first article, in a transient menu, or as described in claim 18, “displaying in a transient menu near the network browser address bar the first URL and at least one hyperlinked menu item included within the first web page.”

Konig, Sommerer, and Dumais also do not disclose “displaying in a transient menu associated with the input field the first article identifier and *at least one hyperlinked menu item included within the first article.*” König generally discusses “providing automatic,

personalized information services.” (Abstract). Sommerer mentions a “browser navigation tool [that] allows a user to browse previously viewed resource pages during a browser session.” (Abstract). Dumais discusses performing “implicit or background queries to one or more information sources based on the ongoing activities of users.” (Abstract). None of these references discloses the limitations missing from Belfiore and Mikheev.

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 2, 18, and 20 are allowable over the cited reference for the reasons described above. Claims 3-17, 36-37, and 40 depend directly or indirectly from claim 2, claims 38, 39, and 41 depend directly or indirectly from claim 18, and claims 21-35 and 42 depend directly or indirectly from claim 20. In addition to containing all of the limitations from the claims from which they depend, respectively, these claims also contain additional limitations that are not shown by the cited references.

Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are allowable over the cited art of record and request that the Examiner allow this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned to advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully Submitted,
DAVID BENJAMIN AUERBACH, ET AL.

Date: August 21, 2007

By: /Brenda M. Simon/

Brenda M. Simon, Attorney of Record
Registration No. 48,449
FENWICK & WEST LLP
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Phone: (650) 335-7198
Fax: (650) 938-5200
E-Mail: bsimon@fenwick.com